United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,378	04/17/2001	Adrian Yap	PD-200144	5201
Hughes Electro	7590 06/14/2007		EXAMINER	
Hughes Electronics Corporation Patent Docket Administration			VENT, JAMIE J	
P.O. Box 956 Bldg. 1, Mail S	Stop A109		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956			2621	
	1			
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/836,378	YAP ET AL.	
•		
Examiner	Art Unit	

3 .,	LAGITITICI	Artonic				
	Jamie Vent	2621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 14 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	• •		ecause			
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	• ,					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attack	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/836,378

Art Unit: 2621

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 14, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 8 applicant argues that Bellamy in view of Garahi in further view of Browne fails to disclose the following limitation, "a memory for storing selected available content and a plurality of selectable status parameters indicating functionality of said digital video recorder..." as recited in Claim 1. Bellamy discloses an enhanced video recorder (EVCR) as recited in Column 3 Lines 18-28 and it is noted that an enhanced video recorder is well known to record digital video. Applicant argues that a video cassette recorder is an analog recording device; however this is untrue. As seen in Yoon (US 5,255,140) a video cassette recorder has the capability of providing a digital recording and thereby further discloses Bellamy having the ability to record digital data via the EVCR. Although, applicants points are understood the examiner cannot agree and therefore the rejection is maintained.

JOHN MILLER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 2

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600